REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or canceled.

Claims 4, 10 and 11 have been amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as discussed above, claims 2-26 are pending in this application.

THIRD REQUEST - Procedural Issue Re: Filing of Certified Copy of Priority Document:

As mentioned in the TWO most recently-filed replies, a certified copy of the priority document was filed, along with a claim for convention priority, with the PTO on January 12, 2001; however, the PTO has not acknowledged receipt of these filings. Such acknowledgement is respectfully requested in the next PTO correspondence.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,388,665 to Linnett in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,115,501 to Kerr and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836 to Huang et al.; claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,141 to Smith in view of Linnett and Huang et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,000,187 to Messinger et al.; claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,141 to Smith in view of Linnett and further in view of Kerr and further in view of Huang et al.; claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,110 to Schein et al. in view of Smith et al. and Linnett and Kerr and further in view of Huang et al.; claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,110 to Schein et al. in view of Smith et al. and Linnett and Kerr and Huang et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,372

-19-

to Barnes; claims 5, 10-13, 16-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Smith et al. and further in view of Huang et al.; claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Schein et al. and Huang et al., and further in view of Messinger et al.; claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. in view of Linnett and further in view of Huang et al.; and claims 6, 14, 15, 20, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Smith et al. and Huang et al., and further in view of Messinger et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Claim 8 recites both overlay software and base software, whereby a GUI widget is displayed and controlled by the overlay software external to and independent of the base software, and whereby the screen is displayed by the base software. Thus, in claim 8, both the base software and the overlay software are utilized in a display, whereby Huang's teachings appear to be directed to replacing the entire base software with new base software, and whereby there is no teaching or suggestion of utilizing base software for performing some display functions and of utilizing overlay software for performing other display functions.

Still further, the Office Action asserts, in substance, that Huang discloses a system in which a GUI external to base software is supplied to a device, whereby the base software is controlled. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Namely, in the system of Huang, the GUI displayed on a device (a PDA) is generated by the base software, and thus is not external to the base software. This is much different from the features recited in claim 8, whereby a GUI of the base software is detected externally (e.g., not by using the base software, but rather by using overlay software) and whereby a different GUI is generated for display.

Also, with respect to Kerr, that reference does not teach or suggest any mechanism for detecting the position of a GUI widget displayed by a base application.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above, and since none of the other cited art of record rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Huang and Kerr, presently pending independent claim 8 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Since all of the other presently pending independent claims recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 8, and since none of the other cited art of record

-20-

rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Huang and Kerr, all of the presently pending independent claims under rejection are patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to presently pending independent claim 2, that claim recites, among other things, a step of displaying a cover screen hiding an inherent screen operated by a base software, which is different from an overlay software that operates said cover screen, on a display device; and a step of analyzing the inherent screen having a GUI widget operated by the base software, the analyzing being performed by the overlay software external to the base software to automatically generate a guidance for subsequent sequence of action on a GUI widget on the cover screen.

Thus, as recited in claim 2, a cover screen is operated by the overlay software, and the inherent screen (hidden by the cover screen) is operated by the base software, and whereby analysis of the inherent screen (the hidden screen) is performed by the overlay software (not the base software) to automatically generate a guidance for subsequent sequence of action on a GUI widget on the cover screen.

Messinger et al. describes a system that provides technical support to and training for a user in operation a software application, whereby the apparatus includes a GUI window through which a plurality of tasks are accomplished, and whereby the GUI window includes a plurality of selectable graphical information input/output areas. A graphical overlay is coupled to the GUI window, whereby the overlay is positioned on top of the GUI window, and whereby a user utilizes a selector coupled to the GUI window to learn a sequence of operations associated with a task through actively interfacing with the GUI window. See column 2, lines 19-36 of Messinger et al.

Messinger et al. also describes that a graphical overlay routine is linked to a main routine via a data link, and whereby an action command routine is employed in the event a user begins performing an action rather than selecting a task. See column 6, lines 53-58 of Messinger et al. Figures 9-12 of Messinger et al. merely show different screen views of a smurf detection task sequence.

The fact that Messinger et al. describes a graphical overlay that is coupled to a GUI window says nothing about what is operating the graphical overlay, whereby it appears that Messinger et al.'s base software at least partially operates the graphical overlay.

Accordingly, the assertions made on page 6 of the Office Action with respect to Messinger et al. are incorrect.

Furthermore, please note that Messinger et al. does not teach or suggest a method or system for analyzing a base application (e.g., a main routine). Thus, Messinger et al. cannot be applied for other applications which do not control an Overlay window.

Therefore, independent claim 2 is patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for independent claim 8.

Similarly, the rejections of claims 6, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23 and 24 based in part on Messinger et al. are traversed, for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 2 (whereby the other cited art of record does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Messinger et al.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _September 1, 2006_   By _Phillip J. Articola_

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   David A. Blumenthal
Customer Number: 22428   Registration No. 26,257
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399   Phillip J. Articola
                                   Registration No. 38,819

-22-